

## REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the communication from the Examiner dated February 12, 2008, regarding the Decision on Appeal dated November 29, 2007. As indicated in the Decision and the communication, the rejections against claims 6, 8, 9, 11-17, 23, 26, 27, 30 and 41 were reversed by the Board. Also, the species election imposed on November 7, 2002 has been rescinded and claims 19, 20, 22, 33 and 37-39 have been rejoined to the patent application.

Claims 6, 11, 16, 23, 26, 30, and 41 have been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Also, claims 1, 24, 28, 34 and 40 were canceled by the Examiner. The remaining dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-5, 7, 10, 18, 21, 24-25, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36 and 40) which were rejected by the Board were canceled in the present paper. Newly rejoined claims 19, 20, 22, 33, and 37-39 were canceled because they depended from a rejected claim. Accordingly, claims 6, 8, 9, 11-17, 23, 26, 27, 30 and 41 are believed to be allowable.


## CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing prosecution of the subject application, Applicant's undersigned attorney invites the Examiner to telephone him at the number provided.

*Respectfully submitted,*

Dated: March 12, 2008



Victor A. Cardona, Esq.  
Attorney for Appellant's  
Reg. No. 44,589

**HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & , P.C.**

5 Columbia Circle  
Albany, NY 12203-5160  
Telephone: (518) 452-5600  
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579